

Leonard R. Berman
9220 SW Barbur Blvd., Suite 119 Box 180
Portland, OR 97219
(503) 516-3715
OSB # 96040
Easyrabbi@yahoo.com

ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFFS

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON
EUGENE DIVISION

TYLER BURNARD, : Case No.: 6:22-cv-1982MC
MICHAEL BRITZIUS, :
DOUGLAS STYLES, :
:

Plaintiffs,

v.

DELORES MATTEUCCI, Personally,
OREGON STATE HOSPITAL,
ADAM GIBLIN, Personally,
Defendants.

PLAINTIFFS' REPLY TO MOTION
FOR LEAVE TO AMEND

Plaintiffs hereby file this Reply to Motion for Leave to Amend.

1. Plaintiffs did not mean to Ignore the Court's ruling on claims of Intentional Interference with Economic Relations.

Plaintiffs did not mean to ignore the Court's Order on IIER. They were was discussion about revisiting the claims after further discovery. In the interim, Plaintiffs do not object to striking the IIER Claim by Interlineation, for now.

2. Plaintiffs contend that claims for bans on mail package shipping and delivery and bans on email sending and receiving are analogous and properly litigated together

Plaintiffs are planning an imminent Motion for a Preliminary Injunction of the package policy. In the interest of Judicial Efficiency. it is most timely to address both policies simultaneously. If the Court will approve a separate Motion for TRO or injunction as to both package and email policies as to plaintiffs and

1 PLAINTIFFS' REPLY TO MOTION FOR LEAVE TO AMEND

Tyler Burnard (Burnard alone) then plaintiffs are happy to so file twice without amending the complaint. Further, plaintiffs hope to strike the Burnard email claim pending timely positive resolution. The Burnard - only email claim would destroy commonality for the pending class action and would not be appropriate for trial adjudication.

As to the lack of relation to the original complaint and claims, plaintiffs contend that both claims are analogous and not “unrelated.” Denial of email access prevents mailing and receiving written and “bound” books, voluminous legal documents, ebooks and audiobooks, in the same way denial of hard-copy mailing and shipment of paper and hard-cover books and/or bound legal materials, or CDs of audio books harm patients under the existing package policy. There is no material reason not to litigate both policies together in the present.

3. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiffs pray the Court grants their Motion for Leave to Amend.

DATED this 9th day of June, 2024.

Respectfully Submitted,

S//S Leonard Berman

LEONARD R. BERMAN, OSB# 96040
Attorney for Plaintiff